



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,970	08/23/2001	David Zelig	22350/17	1333

7590 08/10/2006

Michael J. Berger  
Amster, Rothstein & Ebenstein  
90 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10016

EXAMINER

MEW, KEVIN D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2616

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/935,970	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ZELIG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kevin Mew	<b>Art Unit</b> 2616	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 49-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 49-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Detailed Action***

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's Arguments/Remarks filed 6/5/2006 have been considered. Claims 1-48 have been canceled and claims 49-66 have been newly added by applicant. Claims 49-66 are currently pending.
2. Acknowledgement is made of the canceled claim 14 with respect to the claim objection to claim 14 as set forth in the previous Office Action. The claim objection is now withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 49-51, 55-60, 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mauger et al. (USP 6,507,577).

Regarding claims 49, 58, Mauger discloses an apparatus to perform a method for communication, comprising:

specifying a bi-directional data link layer service (MPLS Layer 2 service; note that MPLS is bi-directional) to be provided through a network of label-switched routers (Layer 2 MPLS Tunnel Switch, col. 2, lines 62-65 and Fig. 4) between at least first and second users

(between user a and user b, Fig. 5), connected to at least first and second respective ports of first and second respective nodes (respective ingress ports 47 and egress ports 48, col. 5, lines 4-17);

configuring the routers to create a first tunnel through the network for conveying packets from the first node to the second node (a first L2TP tunnel for call request), and a second tunnel through the network for conveying the packets from the second node to the first node (a second L2TP tunnel for call reply, col. 6, lines 36-42 and Fig. 5);

in response to a request to initiate the bi-directional data link layer service at the first node, sending a first signaling message containing an indication of the service to be carried through the first tunnel to the second node (exchange topology state packets and report on available bandwidth between nodes, col. 6, lines 25-35);

in response to receiving the first signaling message at the second node, initiating the service at the second node and sending a second signaling message to the first node, wherein the first and second signaling messages are encapsulated in signaling packets so as to establish the service through the first and second tunnels (exchange topology state packets and report on available bandwidth between nodes, col. 6, lines 25-35) while causing all the routers between the first and second nodes to transmit the signaling packets while ignoring the signaling messages (MPLS provides the ability to tunnel through many stages using explicit routing rather than hop-by-hop, col. 1, lines 39-42; note that MPLS tunnels hide details of the IP network topology from the L2TP layer network, col. 6, lines 1-11); and

in response to receiving the second signaling message at the first node, activating the service (establishing the end to end PPP session between two nodes, col. 6, lines 35-42).

Regarding claims 50, 59, Mauger discloses the method according to claim 49, wherein the indication of the service comprises a local index indicative of the service to be provided (session request index A, B, DTL (N1, N2) for a PPP session, col. 6, lines 28-35).

Regarding claims 51, 60, Mauger discloses the method according to claim 49 wherein the service parameters comprise an indication of at least one of the first and second respective ports (N1 and N2, col. 6, lines 28-35).

Regarding claims 55, 64, Mauger discloses the method and apparatus according to claims 49 and 58, wherein the first signaling message contains a field identifying a service type of the requested service (identifying the guaranteed bandwidth service between two VPN user nodes, col. 3, lines 33-36).

Regarding claims 56, 65, Mauger discloses the method and apparatus according to claims 49 and 58, wherein the first signaling message comprises service parameters (bandwidth availability) that are configured to form a part a Management Information Base maintained at the first and second nodes (topology state packets that are exchanged between nodes provide sufficient information on bandwidth availability between nodes, col. 6, lines 31-35).

Regarding claims 57, 66, Mauger discloses the method and apparatus according to claims 49 and 58, wherein the signaling packets comprise resource reservation packets in which the

signaling messages are encapsulated an object having a class number that causes the routers to ignore the object (PPP session identifier that comprises Tunnel ID and Call ID, Fig. 7).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 52, 54, 61, 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mauger et al. (USP 6,507,577) in view of Kong et al. (US Publication 2002/0176450).

Regarding claims 52, 61, Mauger discloses the method according to claim 49 wherein the service comprises an Ethernet connection, and wherein the indication the service is indicative a Virtual LAN (VLAN) value to which the service to be provided (VPN, col. 3, lines 34-46).

However, Kong discloses a SONET network in which multiprotocol Label Switching MPLS routing information can be used along with VLAN ID and Ethernet MAC frame (see paragraph 0060). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined label-switched communication method and network of Mauger with the teaching of Kong in using VLAN ID and Ethernet frame with MPLS routing information such that the service connection to be established is an Ethernet connection and the bearer information comprises VLAN ID. The motivation to do so is to provide the capability to classify Ethernet frames based on MPLS routing information and VLAN ID.

Regarding claims 54, 63, Mauger (USP 6,507,577) discloses does all the aspects of the claimed invention set forth in the rejection of claims 49 and 58 above, except fails to explicitly show the service comprises a SONET service, and wherein the indication of the service is indicative of a SONET path on which the service to be provided.

However, Kong discloses a SONET network wherein the MPLS can be used along with VLAN ID to classify Ethernet frame. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined label-switched communication method and network of Mauger with the teaching of Kong in using MPLS to classify Ethernet frames in a SONET path such that a SONET service is provided and indicated by bearer information.

The motivation to do so is to allow a SONET path be established in order to create a highly reliable, synchronous, and high-speed network for carrying network traffic.

5. Claims 53, 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mauger et al. (USP 6,507,577) in view of Mauger et al. (USP 6,886,043).

Regarding claims 53, 62, Mauger (USP 6,507,577) does all the aspects of the claimed invention set forth in the rejection of claims 49 and 58 above, except fails to explicitly show the service comprises a transparent LAN service (TLS), and wherein the indication the service indicative of an instance on which the service is to be provided.

However, Mauger (USP 6,886,043) discloses a MPLS network in which the service comprises a transparent LAN service (TLS) (**virtual private network VPN**, see col. 7, lines 7-34), and wherein the index is indicative of a TLS instance on which service to be

provided (a particular VPN network identified by the three-layer label stacks of the LSP, see col. 7, lines 7-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined label-switched communication method and network of Mauger (USP 6,507,577) with the teaching of Mauger (USP 6,886,043) in using MPLS label stacks to identify a VPN such that Mauger (USP 6,507,577) will provide a service comprising a transparent LAN service (TLS), and wherein the indication the service indicative of an instance on which the service is to be provided.

The motivation to do so is to provide connection-oriented behavior for voice traffic while retaining edge control analogous to standard IP network operation.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 49-66 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.



***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Mew whose telephone number is 571-272-3141. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kevin Mew *Km*  
Work Group 2616

  
RICKY Q. NGO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER